

### **REMARKS**

Preliminarily, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the time spent discussing the Application and proposed amendments to the claims. In light of those discussions and to focus on only certain claims for prosecution in the present Application, Applicant has canceled claims 7-9 and 11-24 and amended claims 1, 6 and 10 as set forth above, which as discussed below, Applicant submits renders the pending claims allowable over the cited art.

In the subject Office Action, various claims stand objected to for various informalities and/or rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. With regard to the informalities of certain claims pointed out in the Office Action, Applicant notes these claims have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicant submits any informalities have been obviated and thus request withdrawal of any such objection. With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejections, Applicant notes that the Office Action cites seven references, namely, Gillette, Williams, Kahn, Kiuchi, Sherlock, Heller and Driver.

#### **Gillette, Williams, Heller & Driver**

With regard to Gillette, Williams, the Office Action states that the references variously disclose at least one raised rib integrated with an inner surface of the tubular structure, in varying formations. However, in contrast, Applicant submits that claim 1 has been amended to recite “at least two, stiffness increasing, criss-crossing raised ribs, integrated with and extending from said inner surface.” Gillette discloses only one rib, and thus cannot disclose two criss-crossing ribs. While Williams appears to disclose two ribs, there is no disclosure of two criss-crossing ribs. Like Gillette, Driver discloses only one rib. Moreover, the ribs of Driver not “stiffness increasing,” but rather, running sensing devices (fluid detection) along the length of pipe.

As such, Applicant submits that Gillette does not disclose each and every element of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1 (and claims depending therefrom) based upon Gillette.

**Kahn, Kiuchi & Sherlock,**

With regard to Kahn, Kiuchi and Sherlock, the Office Action notes that each of these references discloses "at least one raised rib integrated with an outer surface" and rejects various claims based on each these references. However, in contrast, Applicant submits that claim 1 has been amended to recite "at least two, stiffness increasing, criss-crossing raised ribs, integrated with and extending from said inner surface." Irrespective of various other elements not disclosed, none of these three references disclose a rib on an inner surface of the tubular structure. As such, Applicant submits that none of Kahn, Kiuchi or Sherlock disclose each and every element of amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1 (and claims depending therefrom) based upon these references.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the currently pending claims 1-6 and 10 properly set forth that which Applicant regards as his invention and are allowable over the cited prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (602) 382-6337 at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject Application. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. **This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.**

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Damon L. Boyd, Reg. No. 44,552

**SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.**

One Arizona Center  
400 E. Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Direct: (602) 382-6337  
Fax: (602) 382-6070  
Email: dboyd@swlaw.com